

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

---

UNITED ACCESS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CENTURYTEL BROADBAND SERVICES,  
LLC and QWEST CORPORATION,

Defendants.

---

C.A. No. 11-339-LPS

---

UNITED ACCESS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AT&T INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

C.A. No. 11-338-LPS

---

UNITED ACCESS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS  
CORPORATION,

Defendant.

---

C.A. No. 11-341-LPS

**ORDER**

At Wilmington, this **4th** day of **November, 2016**:

For the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Opinion issued this date,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion to Strike (D.I. 152) is DENIED AS

MOOT.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the disputed claim terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,844,596 (“the ’596 patent”), 6,243,446 (“the ’446 patent”) and 6,542,585 (“the ’585 patent”) are construed as follows:

<b>Claim Term</b>	<b>Court’s Construction</b>
<b>“signal interface”</b>  [’596 patent claim 61; ’446 patent claims 1-3; ’585 patent claims 1, 2, 4, and 8]	“a device interposed on the opposite end (i.e., the local side) of the public trunk line (i.e., the telephone lines comprising the public telephone network) from the telephone exchange that performs the recited functions of the incorporated circuitry”
<b>“telephone exchange”</b>  [’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claim 1; ’585 patent claim 1]	“a switching center for connecting and switching phone lines”
<b>“high frequency band of frequencies above the highest frequency of the telephone voice band,” “high frequency band,” “high band of frequencies”</b>  [’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claims 1 and 3; ’585 patent claims 1 and 4]	“frequencies above the telephone voice band between 0.25 MHZ and an undetermined upper limit”
<b>“telephone voice band”</b>  [’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claim 1; ’585 patent claim 1]	band of frequencies of 0-4 kHz
<b>“external source of information”</b>  [’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claim 1; ’585 patent claims 1 and 8]	“the provider of non-telephone signals”

<p><b>“external signals”</b></p> <p>[’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claims 1 and 4; ’585 patent claims 1 and 2]</p>	<p>“non-telephone signals sent to the signal interface”</p>
<p><b>“telephone wiring network”</b></p> <p>[’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claims 1-3; ’585 patent claim 1]</p>	<p>“a network of twisted pair wiring”</p>
<p><b>“signal interface including . . . circuitry for limiting transmission of the [internal signal / signals] in the high frequency band from the telephone wiring network to the telephone exchange”</b></p> <p>[’446 claim 1; ’585 patent claim 1]</p>	<p>“the signal interface includes circuitry that prevents high frequency signals (as construed) from traveling upstream from the signal interface to the telephone exchange”</p>
<p><b>“a telephone wiring network used for passing telephone signals in a telephone voice band between a plurality of telephone devices and a telephone exchange”</b></p> <p>[’596 patent claim 61; ’446 claims 1-3; ’585 patent claim 1]</p>	<p>The preamble of each asserted claim is a substantive limitation which must be considered in the infringement analysis.</p> <p>Accordingly, “the telephone wiring network (as defined above) is used for passing telephone signals in the telephone voice band (as defined above) to the telephone exchange”</p>



HON. LEONARD P. STARK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE